UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/538,241	11/16/2005	Guldo Vendel	102132-27	3633	
	7590 06/30/200 AUGHLIN & MARCU	EXAMINER			
875 THIRD AV		BRANDT, CHRISTOPHER M			
18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2617		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,241	VENDEL ET AL.	
ı	Examiner	Art Unit	

	CHRISTOPHER M. BRANDT	2617						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
	out prior to the data of filing a bring	حط لمصمعهم مطاعم ما النب						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better.	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)	* **							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 21-32. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail: e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	try is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/George Eng/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617								

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3 and 11. The application is not in condition for allowance by simply cancelling claim 22 and incorporating it into independent claim 21. As indicated in the before, Masseroni teaches a RLC/MAC data block is identified to the TBF to which is associated through its own field where the identifier TFI is written. So, if one is comparing TBFs, they are essentially comparing the RLC/MAC blocks as disclosed in Masseroni. In addition, Tolli discloses monitoring (i.e. evaluating) the average experienced delay of the NRT users as well as the number of TBF users (i.e. multiuser operation). The experienced delay of the NRT users is caused by the multiuser operation or many mobile stations using the system. With regard to the arguments pertaining to the dependent claims, The examiner has addressed in detail the arguments the applicants have revisited again in this communication and the examiner is not persuaded by these previously presented arguments. As a result, the examiner holds his rejection and arguments that were communicated to applicants in the Final Office Action dated February 5, 2008

Chris Brandt Art Unit 2617 06/26/2008